

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. SIMSG 01-01.PA 03/05/2001 Gregory A. Sims 4533 09/800,153 02/12/2003 7590 Quirk & Tratos **EXAMINER** Suite 500 North KIM, CHRISTOPHER S 3773 Howard Hughes Parkway Las Vegas, NV 89109 ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 3752

DATE MAILED: 02/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

_				N
٥.		Application No.	Applicant(s)	//
		09/800,153	SIMS, GREGORY A.	
Office	Action Summary	Examin r	Art Unit	
	•	Christopher S. Kim	3752	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app ars on the cov r she t with the corr spondenc addr ss Period for Reply				
A SHORTENED THE MAILING D Extensions of time m after SIX (6) MONTH - If the period for reply - If NO period for reply - Failure to reply within - Any reply received by	STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. ay be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 S from the mailing date of this communication. specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, the Office later than three months after the mailing djustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication (D) (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ı.
1)⊠ Responsi	ve to communication(s) filed on <u>09 L</u>	<u>December 2002</u> .		
2a)☐ This actio	n is FINAL . 2b)⊠ Th	is action is non-final.		
closed in	application is in condition for allowa accordance with the practice under			is
Disposition of Clair				
,	1-19 is/are pending in the application			
	above claim(s) <u>13-19</u> is/are withdraw	n from consideration.		
	is/are allowed.			
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1</u>	<u>-12</u> is/are rejected.			
7) Claim(s) _	is/are objected to.			
8) Claim(s) Application Papers	are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.		
9)☐ The specific	cation is objected to by the Examine	r.	,	
10)□ The drawing	g(s) filed on is/are: a) accep	oted or b) objected to by the Exa	miner.	
Applicant :	may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. S	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
11) The propos	ed drawing correction filed on	_is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disappro	oved by the Examiner.	
If approve	d, corrected drawings are required in rep	oly to this Office action.		
12)∏ The oath or	declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer.		
Priority under 35 U.	S.C. §§ 119 and 120			
13) Acknowled	lgment is made of a claim for foreign	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a	a)-(d) or (f).	
a)∏ All b)∏	Some * c) ☐ None of:			
1.☐ Cert	ified copies of the priority documents	s have been received.		
2.☐ Cert	ified copies of the priority documents	s have been received in Applicat	ion No	
	ies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bur ched detailed Office action for a list	reau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).		
14)⊠ Acknowledg	ment is made of a claim for domesti	c priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application	on).
, —	anslation of the foreign language pro Iment is made of a claim for domesti			
Attachment(s)				
	es Cited (PTO-892) son's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>2</u>	5) Notice of Informal	y (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Patent Application (PTO-152)	

Application/Control Number: 09/800,153

Art Unit: 3752

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Invention I (claims 1-12) in Paper No. 4 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that: claims 18 and 19 require a manifold; claim 16 recites "measuring the amount of pesticide injected through the port" (this being a typographical error and should be a new paragraph within the claims); and distribution system is implicit and "manifold" is a very broad term. This is not found persuasive because: claim 17 is an evidence claim for patentability without the manifold; acknowledging the typographical error of claim 16, Invention I (claim 1) can be used to practice another and materially different process which do not require a processor. Based on the typographical error, restriction between Invention III and IV is withdrawn but they remain patentably distinct from elected Invention I as indicated above. Examiner acknowledges that Claims 16-19 should be grouped into one Invention.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. Claims 13-19 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected Invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper No. 4.

Application/Control Number: 09/800,153

Art Unit: 3752

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claims 1, 2, 5, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jackson (4,800,672).

Jackson discloses a system for distributing pesticide comprising: a port 63; a distribution manifold 57; a plurality of elongate tubing members 55, 52, 51; fluid discharge openings 53.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. Claims 3, 4 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jackson (4,800,672).

With respect to claims 3 and 4, Jackson discloses the limitations of the claimed invention with the exception of the at least six outlets and at least eight outlets. Jackson schematically shows, in figure 4, two additional lines leading from selector valve 60. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

Application/Control Number: 09/800,153

Art Unit: 3752

invention to have provided additional outlets to the device of Jackson for utilization in large buildings and/or provide additional distribution zones.

With respect to claims 10 and 11, Jackson discloses a flow measuring means 54.

Jackson does not disclose a recording means. Flow-measuring means and recording means for providing a printed record are well known in the art. For example gas station pumps have flow sensors and provide printed receipts. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided a a recording means to the device of Jackson to provide a receipt for record purposes.

With respect to claim 12, Jackson discloses a flow measuring means 54 (a pressure gauge) but it is not audible. Audible indicators are well known. For example, air dispensers for inflating tires have audible bell indicators instead of pressure gauges to indicate how much air is dispensed. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided an audible signal means instead of the pressure gauge in the device of Jackson for use by visually impaired persons.

7. Claims 6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jackson (4,800,672) in view of Manciet (6,463,694).

It should be noted that air is usually not considered an inert gas but the examiner is utilizing applicant's definition in the specification, on page 6, lines 23-24, wherein it recites "inert gas, such as compressed air (or nitrogen)."

Jackson discloses the limitations of the claimed invention with the exception of the details of the injection device. Manciet discloses, in figures 13-14, an injection

Application/Control Number: 09/800,153 Page 5

Art Unit: 3752

device comprising: an inert gas inlet 1306; a pesticide inlet 1330; a valve means 1324. It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have provided the injection device of Manciet to the system of Jackson to enable and provide a mobile supply source.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Woodson; Lundwall; Cretti; Tallon; Jenkins; King et al. disclose pest control systems.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher S. Kim whose telephone number is (703) 308-8336. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday, 6:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Y. Mar can be reached on (703) 308-2087. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 308-7766 for regular communications and (703) 308-7766 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

CK February 7, 2003

